



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

follow the chronological order of events, causes confusion and repetitions in many places; especially in the reigns of Richard II. and Henry VI.

There is also a vagueness and lack of definiteness of statement which is unnecessary and annoying. Opportunities are frequently missed where the addition of a word or two, or even a slight change in the phraseology, would bring out clearly an important fact in a concrete and definite form.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

*Genesis of Lancaster or the Three Reigns of Edward II., Edward III., Richard II., 1307-1399.* By Sir JAMES H. RAMSAY of Bamff, LL.D., Litt.D. In two volumes. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1913. Pp. xxxi, 495; xv, 446.)

THE world of historical scholarship will heartily congratulate Sir James Ramsay upon the completion of the fifth and last installment of a work upon which he has been laboring for over forty years. "My grown-up children do not remember the time when it was not in progress", he writes, in a preface of pardonable pride, in which he views the past from the pinnacle of years. The same method, already made familiar in other volumes, is here adhered to—the aim to give a picture of the times, events, and people with special treatment of military matters, finance, and statistics, amply buttressed with references. Emphasis is laid upon the fact that the work is a general history, "because for internal affairs the *Constitutional History* of Bishop Stubbs stands alone". This dualism has caused a structural weakness throughout the work which Sir James's method has not overcome. For a *general* history of England during so important a period as the Hundred Years' War the work is quantitatively too brief, and qualitatively defective. In his implicit reliance upon Stubbs and older writers than he, the author is unaware of the progress made in English constitutional history in these latter years. It is painfully evident that Sir James Ramsay is not abreast of modern scholarship. The history of the war is almost wholly written from English sources. For the French end of it—with the exception of Froissart, one of the poorest of sources—use is made of secondary works, like Coville's volume in Lavissee's *Histoire de France*. But the main reliance is put upon Sismondi, Martin, Longman, Milman, and Kitchin! Cardinal works are unhonored and uncited, like Déprez's *Les Préliminaires de la Guerre de Cent Ans*; Moisant's *Le Prince Noir en Aquitaine*; Luce's *La Jacquerie* and *Du Guesclin*; Flammermont's notable article in the *Revue Historique* for 1879 upon the Jacquerie; Viard's studies upon the finances of the first Valois; Delachenal's *Le Règne de Charles V.*, besides many excellent articles in numerous French reviews. Even notable books or articles in English seem to be unknown, like Burrows's *The Family of Brocas of Beaur-*

*paire and Roche Court*—the best thing in English upon Edward III.'s policy in Guyenne; Miss Ferris's article on "The Financial Relations of the Knights Templars to the English Crown", in the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, VIII. 1-17.

Sir James's treatment of things on the Continent is usually antiquated and superficial. The statement that the "centralizing policy and fiscal exactions of Philip IV. had destroyed the national life" seems an echo of Sismondi or the anti-monarchical school of historians of the early part of the nineteenth century. "His last hours", we are told, "were harassed by the uprising of a league of barons and burghers united in opposition to his tyranny." But Lehugeur—whose name is misprinted in a foot-note in volume I., page 140—specifically states in his book on *Philippe le Long* (I. 277) that these reactions were purely feudal and did not draw in either the clergy or the popular classes, and were looked upon with indifference even by the greater nobility (*cf.* Dufayard, "La Réaction Féodale sous les Fils de Philippe le Bel", *Revue Historique*, LIV. 241-272; LV. 241-290). When the treatment of French matters is not narrow and antiquated it is often loose and inexact. Sir James does not know what a bastide is (I. 141); the account of the Black Prince in Guyenne shows slender knowledge of the nature and working of feudal institutions there; the estimate of Pedro the Cruel is based on the mendacity of his detractors, whereas in some ways Pedro was as enlightened a king as Charles V.; the sagacious policy of Charles V. leading up to the renewal of the war in 1369 takes no cognizance of his administrative reforms; there is no clear understanding of the intricacies involved in the last part of article I. of the treaty of Bretigni nor the meticulous course of the French king. Apparently Delisle's admirable *Mandements de Charles V.* (477-480, 561, 686) has not been examined. Even in military matters one doubts the author's judgments. A reading of Professor Tout's article on "Some Neglected Fights between Crecy and Poitiers", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XX. 726 (1905) would have illuminated some paragraphs.

Sir James Ramsay has ever been distinguished for his use of statistics. He justly claims in the matter of finance "to have done substantial work". The same virtue attaches to his treatment of the customs. He estimates the revenue of Edward I. to have been £95,000 a year "or upwards"; that of Edward III. £140,000. Statistical data for the Middle Ages are much richer for England than for France and Sir James has had long experience in handling English figures. I am not so sure of his accuracy, however, when it comes to the Continent. The only French statistics he examines are those touching the ransom of King John. He estimates the three million gold crowns imposed in 1360 at £500,000. In the preface we are told that he "continues his attacks on chroniclers' figures and still struggles to bring scholars and the general public to a better appreciation of their untrustworthiness". Now granting that medieval chroniclers usually exaggerate their figures,

it is to be noted that the sum of John's ransom is not a chronicler's statement but a black and white provision of a formal treaty of peace. I am sure in this case Sir James has much underestimated the amount of ransom. Cosneau (*Les Grands Traités de la Guerre de Cent Ans*, 1889, p. 47, note 4) figures the intrinsic value of the *écu d'or* at 13 fr. 25, which would make the ransom exceed £1,500,000 in modern money. Coville (in Lavissee, *Histoire de France*, IV. 1, p. 154) says the amount was "près de quarante millions de francs", a conclusion based upon M. de Wailly's exhaustive study of the variations of the livre made in 1857 and carefully revised by M. Prou. Moreover the calculations regarding details of the history of the ransom seem incorrect. It is assumed that all of the Visconti dowry of 600,000 *écus* went as partial payment. How does he know? Froissart (VI. 23-24) is vague. Villani (IX. 103) alleges that this sum was paid in two installments; Corio mentions a first payment of 100,000 and a second of 500,000. The first payment seems likely, for in Rymer it appears that the Black Prince in April, 1362, remitted 100,000 florins to his father. Under March 1, 1368, there is record of a receipt for 100,000 florins from Jean Galeazzo, but this may be a tardy receipt for the sum remitted in 1362. Knowing King John's extravagance and negligence of affairs of state as we do, and with the evidence as imperfect as it is, it seems to the reviewer that Sir James Ramsay has assumed much in order to balance his accounts.

Doubtless the calculations with reference to English matters leave less to conjecture, for the data are fuller and Sir James is an expert in English medieval statistics. But there is a doubt at the root of these. Nowhere do the volumes show a large comprehension of the economic revolution through which England went in the fourteenth century. To be sure the importance of the wool-trade in terms of figures, and the economic effects of the Black Death are briefly observed. But the great war, to the author, is purely one of ambition on Edward III.'s part—"a huge crime . . . the most unjust and mischievous war that ever was waged". There is no appreciation of the important commercial causes of the war; no perception of the fact that Edward was fighting to protect the wool-trade of England in its Flemish relations and the wine-trade of Guyenne from French aggression; that the fisheries were a factor in the struggle; that England's claim to the sovereignty of the sea and the growth of her marine were indispensable to this protection. How can customs and revenue statistics be understood save in the light of England's great commercial growth in the fourteenth century?

Even in the venerable subject of parliamentary advance Sir James is the dupe of the illusions of the old school of historians who wrote before Maitland, Vinogradoff, and Petit-Dutaillis. For example the statutes of *Provisors* and *Praemunire* are alluded to as things of "dread", and Blackstone (!) is cited in proof thereof. But recent research has shown that these statutes for years were more honored in the breach than in the observance. The author has been deceived by

following Stubbs too closely. The great illusion of Stubbs, as Petit-Dutaillis and Maitland have shown, was fetish-worship of the English constitution.

As a whole the second volume of the *Genesis of Lancaster*, which deals almost altogether with the domestic history of England to the fall of the Plantagenet house, is superior to the first. A large portion of it is taken up with the revolt of 1381 where Réville, Powell, Oman, and Trevelyan seem to be faithfully followed. But the reluctant judgment of the reviewer is that the work fails of being a completely trustworthy and "up-to-date" history of the period in question. The maps and press-work are excellent, but more careful proof-reading would have eliminated variant spellings, *e. g.*, Arragon and Aragon.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

*The History of the Grain Trade in France, 1400-1710.* By ABBOTT PAYSON USHER, Ph.D. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1913. Pp. xv, 405.)

THIS volume is in every way in keeping with the character of the series of which it is a part. It is thorough and scholarly, is based on minute and extensive research in the manuscript records and, while not always indicating as complete an assimilation of the material as might be wished, there is ample evidence that the author has a good grasp of his subject. This does not, however, prevent the book from being difficult and dry. Indeed the overcrowding of detail not infrequently destroys the interest by obscuring the place of the grain trade in the general conditions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There is not enough feeling for its relation to the life of France and of Europe during these centuries. On the other hand the work satisfies to an unusual degree an essential requirement of all monographs in that it is a thorough study of an important phase of a large and important subject, and is therefore a very material contribution to economic history. As the title indicates, the author limits himself to the movement of grain within France; a commendable departure from the over-ambitious aspirations of many writers in the field who like Araskhaniantz are misled into taking the foreign trade also, with the inevitable result of getting overwhelmed by the mass of material to be controlled. Similarly, by concluding with 1709, a degree of unity is secured which would inevitably have been sacrificed if the eighteenth century had been included. The story of the grain trade of that century is more dramatic, it is true, but it is also marked by changes and the operation of new forces, especially that of the physiocrats and their struggle for freedom of trade.

The work is divided into two parts. The first treats in separate chapters: markets and market organization; areas of highly localized markets and misery entailed through dearth of supply; the history of